

Subject: KRUBA,

Source: 20

Date: 21 Sept 1967

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

SECRET

1. In his letter dtd 15 Aug 1967 Subject informed Source that he had arrived from Kiev a week ago, together with his wife whom he managed to get out thanks to the intervention of the French Embassy in Moscow, and that he was going to stay in France until approx. 10 Sept, 1967. Most of his time he will be vacationing in Tourcoing, North France.

On 17 Aug 1967 Source met with Subject and his wife Angelina, born in Sumy, partly of Polish origin, Ukrainian, just graduated from VUZ as engineer of Automobile-Transportation Department, in her early twenties.

The meeting was very short because Subject was in hurry to go to Angelina's uncle in Paris who had been in France since Revolution 1917-20 and ~~lived~~ among Russian veterans of that time. Source and Subject arranged for a meeting next day.

2. On 18 Aug Subject came to Source's house together with his wife. As Source noticed ^{already on previous day} Subject had no secrets before his wife and spoke quite openly in her presence. Angelina seemed to take it for granted and on her part partook quite actively in conversations. Her expressions were usually very succinct, to the point, and clearcut, contrary to her husband's way of talking. They were on their way to Tourcoing and spent two hours with Source.

3. Following is the gist of what has been discussed:

a/ About himself Subject said that his sojourn in Kiev had been prolonged for another year but he hoped to visit France again, in the meantime, on Christmas. He had trouble to get his wife out of the Soviet Union but finally succeeded. Of great help was the fact that formally he is listed as "a collaborator" of French cultural attache.

Lately in Kiev he worked on an anthology of French poetry which is now

SECRET

in print. On it he collaborated with KOCHUR Hryhori, and SVITLYCHNY Ivan and many others who though did not know French were very keen on being listed in the anthology. Among those were DRACH Ivan and PAVLYCHKO Dmytro.

Subject has already finished his thesis on M. Kotsiubynsky but for this PhD degree he will have to submit another additional thesis or rather treatise, and he thinks of some Russian theme, to "satisfy French Slavists". Most probably he will do some work on Sovremennik.

Source suggested that he should stick to Ukrainian literature also in his second work since this will give him in France a "monopolistic" position among Slavists as a Ukrainianist.

b/ The Congress of Ukrainian Writers of last November was rigged and speakers were accordingly selected. Official speeches and announcements have practically no obligatory power. At least Subject discerned nothing that would indicate that matters really had changed after the Congress.

Most appreciated and praised is HONCHAR Oles whose speech is regarded very patriotic and courageous. Surprisingly enough, primarily among "official" writers' circles.

Incidentally, the division ^{and differentiation} into official and unofficial writers gets more and more accentuated. Official writers were against young writers' active participation in the Congress from the very beginning. This caused some quarrels and squabbles between the "official" and "unofficial" groups but their importance should not be exaggerated. Some writers among the young, took a disdainful attitude to the Congress on the whole, and like VYHRANOVSKY preferred to make no speeches at all.

VYHRANOVSKY turned now completely to the cinematography though his poetry collection will probably soon be published. There was a strong pressure on him to make some corrections but he refused to, and finally it seemed he ~~was~~ prevailed.

SECRET

VINHRANOVSKY simply did not care. He was financially secured and could wait. In somewhat different position is Lina KOSTENKO whose financial means are quite meagre, but she continues to refuse to make any changes in her poetry, whatsoever.

To the "unofficial" writers Subject also counted HOLOBOROD'KO, ZHYLENKO, YOVENKO, KALYNETS', KIRYAN, LUBKIVSKY, MYSYK, ~~plus xxx~~ RUDLYK and MOVCHAN, the "unpublished" ones.

DRACH is following KOROTYCH'S suit but some still hope he will turn back. No one has any illusions about KOROTYCH. Everything he said at the Congress was "on order". Also all his trips are to be regarded as purely official missions.

PAVLYCHKO is also connected with official circles ~~but~~ he is very clever. Subject could not confirm that PAVLYCHKO was a KGB officer and he heard about it first here, abroad.

Among the young, Subject mentioned Ludmila SKYRDA as "official". According to Subject "this had been already in the family"; one of her relatives is a high KGB officer.

c/ SVITLYCHNY Ivan has no steady job and works on translations from French. Recently he finished a collection by Superville(?). He is under strict surveillance and on the whole in very miserable situation. He would be much better off if he would accept ~~xxxx~~ offers from "those in power". Angelina added: "from the KGB". Subject sees SVITLYCHNY quite often.

d/ DZIUBA Ivan continues to work with Bio-chemical Journal and has an offer from TVARDOVSKY to write articles on Ukrainian literature for Novi Mir.

At present DZIUBA is working on his book on Ukrainian nationalism. It should ~~be~~ something about development of Ukrainian nationalism. His treatise "Internationalism or Russification" is widely known in official circles and also among students. Mass public is less familiar with it.

According to what he was told by KOZAK Stefan of Poland this treatise should be already "out of Ukraine" and had ~~probably~~ reached the West.

SECRET

e/ No one or at least very few expect SINIAVSKY and DANIEL to be released in the course of the rumored amnesty to come. The same applies to HORYNS and other Ukrainian intellectuals imprisoned in the camps. Their situation is even worse because they have even less support than the two Russians.

f/ The arrival of SEMICHASTNY in Kiev is very suspicious. In one place he had said that if he would be allowed to pick up 300 people there would be no more 'strange trials' for some time to come. Where did SEMICHASTNY say ^{that} Subject did not know, but "it is being talked about ^{that} in Kiev". On the whole all people assume that SEMICHASTNY'S arrival might herald a new intensification of terror in the Ukraine.

g/ The most read paper in Kiev is Vachirny Kiev, and sports papers. This is in what ~~the~~ youth is primarily interested. Angelina did some subscribing campaign for Ukrainian papers in her VUZ and her conclusion was that it was not easy to interest students in purely literary and moreover "political" publications.

h/ In Subject's opinion it did little matter that in Moscow were so many Ukrainian on the top echelons. He doubted, PODGORNYY, for instance, should have any special sentiment for Ukraine, although it would be also wrong ^{to assert} that those in Moscow would ^{be} deliberately interested in harming Ukrainians in the Ukraine. As to party and administrative cadres in the Ukraine as well as elsewhere, they are of sevilistic mold and serve "nachalstvo" unreservedly.

i/ Source and Subject discussed also various books for which Subject promised to look in Kiev, and was given books to be taken with him. The list is ^{given} separately. They also discussed the possibility of financial help to people in the Ukraine.

j/ Subject said he brought no zakhalavny stuff with him and was

< S

right by doing so. At the customs control he had a very strict search of his baggage and particularly of all the books he had with him. He was not, however, subjected to a body search; (nor his wife.)

k/ Subject was interested in Koshelivets affair about which he had heard from KOZAK Stefan. Source explained the matter.

4. On 25 Aug, 1967 Source met again with Subject and his wife. They discussed what books are to be left in Poland and which are for Ukraine. Source brought additionally "History of Ukrainian Literature" by Hrushevsky.

Following is the gist of their conversation or rather of what Source was told by Subject:

a/ In Kiev most of emigre publications could be read in the Library of the CC CPU but only those with party membership cards are admitted. Many people go there to read Suchasnist and other publications and sooner or later contents of individual articles "soak into public", and people discuss them.

b/ Asked about MASIUTKO and KARAVANSKY, Subject said he knew nothing about them at present. He could not also say whether MALANCHUK G. had written his treatise on ^{his own} ~~the~~ initiative or on "suggestion" of the CC CPU.

c/ According to Subject SHELEST, SHCHERBYTSKY, KOROTCHENKO and other "personalities" in Kiev are small people and all important matters are being handled directly by Moscow. In his opinion SHELEST had no influence on the character and ~~development~~ course of arrests and trials of 1965/66 and these matters very under control and in hands of the KGB and Moscow center (CC CPSU). To all intents and purposes the KGB made some mistakes by ~~making~~ ^{letting} the whole story *become* widely known "but they are not infallible either".

d/ According to Subject, in 1966 there was another lawyers' affair in Kiev. A group of Ukrainian lawyers submitted a memorandum on the legal status of Ukrainian SSR and its international status to

SECRET

"the highest authorities". As a result of that several lawyers had been arrested and deported to the camps without trial. Subject stressed that this happened in 1966 and ~~xxx~~ he was not talking about a previous event of 1961.

e/ Trials in Lvov were more widely known than those in Kiev. In Lvov came to street demonstrations.

f/ According to Subject, Mrs STASHYNSKA, ^{STASHYNSKA} ~~xxx~~ a relative of L. STAR - CHERNIAKHIVSKA (who had died on deportation to Siberia in 1941), would like to have ^{the book by} ~~materials~~ about ~~xxx~~ HIRNIAK and she was also looking for a relative of LYSENKO. STASHYNSKA lives in Kiev and keeps a very fine Ukrainian, private library. She is one of "patrons" of Ukrainian culture in Kiev.

5. On 27 Aug 1967, Source met with Subject and his wife in Paris. Subject left with Source his translation of Tini... by Kotsiubynsky. Source promised to discuss the matter of publication ^{at Gallimars} and introduction by RAVICH, with the latter, in the nearest future. (Subject wants his translation of Kotsiubynsky to be published at Gallimars.)

They also discussed the ~~xxxxxx~~ issue of aid on the spot and their future correspondence through French Embassy in Moscow.

Before parting Angelina suggested to make a picture and Source took first a photograph of them, and then posed together with both them.

6. On 5 Sept 1967 Source met with Subject and his wife at Rubais, at Subject's relatives. Following is the gist of their conversation:

a/ Subject has mainly contacts with "selected pedagogics" in French lecturing approx. 20 hours per week. Students, as a rule, are not allowed to his lectures.

b/ Asked whether Ukrainian students publish something similar like Russian "Phoenix" and alike, Source and Angelina replied that there are circulating all kind of papers, documents etc. but not exactly in the form of "Phoenix".

According to Angelina, students as a rule "sabotage" Komsomol's instruction and initiatives, and for instance, in VUZ-y, quite often, instead of electing candidates suggested by Komsomol, they elect their own people by acclamation. Also in other elections there use to be more and more cases of crossing out of candidates, adding of anti-regime comments, etc.

c/ As interesting people in Kiev, Subject mentioned in addition to I. STASHYNSKA, another "patron" of Ukrainian culture by the name SEVRUK, fnu, an elderly lady who keeps "a small museum" of Ukrainian paintings and graphic-works. Also: Yu. IVAKIN, an ~~experts~~ expert on Shevchenko, in the Academy of Sciences, Ukr SSR; O. ANDREYEVSKA- author of French Dictionary; and Mykola LUKASH.

d/ As a rule, young writers, poets, and artists are denied permits to go abroad, or at the best, are being sent to different countries than these they would like to visit. On all official missions are being sent "trusted people". In short, chances of travelling abroad for Ukrainian young intellectuals are very small.

Subject tried to help along Franco-Ukrainian cultural relations, and was going to use for that purpose the publication of French anthology in Kiev, and preparations for publication of Camus. Incidentally, Kiev does not want to publish Camus' dramas and essays because they are "frightened" by them.

Some time ago, on request of Tabo (phonetical spelling, probably it was Tableau?), the French cultural attache in Moscow, Subject named DRACH Ivan and BRATON Rostyslav as members of Soviet ~~writers~~ ^{Ukrainian} delegation to be invited to France. The French were planning to invite representatives of writers of all Soviet republics.

SECRET

e/ According to Subject PARADZANOV is now "under pressure". They blocked his film "Sayat Nova" on a Armenian legend, and also stopped the implementation of his film on Kiev ^{Prescoes} ~~Kyivsk~~, in Ukrainian. PARADZANOV asked to convey some cuts from hi film "Sayat Nova" to the impressario H. de Sereville (of 134 rue de la Poms, Paris 16) and to ask him for an article about it in ~~xxx~~ French press.

f/ Subject and his wife will return via ~~Poland~~ East Germany and Poland.

7. The list of books taken by Subject:

Do Khvyli - 1
Storinky z Istoriyi KPU -1
Suchasnist 7/66 - 8/67 - 14
Istoriia Literatury by Hrushevsky -1
Pyat' Aktoriv - 1
Novi Poeziyi # 9 - 1
Adresar Slavistyky u Frantsiyi - 1
Ukrayinski Entsyklopediyi - 1
Na Bahriianomu Koni Revolutsiyi - 1
Zelene Vyno - 1
Girassol -1
Ukrainian Anthology in French - 2

Also: copy from La Presse about Podhorny's leaflet at the Expo and other presscutting on Soviet Pavilion from "the Montreal Star" and others.